





For claim 7, the Examiner found that the phrase “according to the bid values” lacks antecedent basis. The antecedent basis is in claim 1 “generating bid values.” Nevertheless Claim 7 has been amended to state that “the sequence of the bid values is ascending order.”

For claims 9 and 10, the Examiner found that the phrase “the value of the bids falling within” lack antecedent basis. The claims are amended to “the bid values” within a range or ranges.

For claim 12, the Examiner found that the phrase “the bids in any other range” lacks antecedent basis. The claim is amended to “the bid values in the ranges other than the critical range.”

In view of these comments and amendments the Applicants respectfully request that the objections based of 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

### **Response to Claim Rejection under 35 USC §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,633,923 to Kukura, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Kukura discloses a method, in the context of client-server networks, for “creating and managing one or more interceptors,” which are “locality-constrained objects” that are implemented by Object Request Broker (ORB) services. See col. 3, line 59 - col. 4, line 15; col. 6, lines 35-45. Inceptors “provide hooks to programmer to execute their piece of code at certain points during ORB.” Col. 2, lines 22-29. While Kukura elaborates on this method in detail, it acknowledges that communication of objects between the client and server requires the use of the appropriate “specified data communication transport layer protocol,” such as the background section cited by the Examiner. Col. 1, lines 53 - col. 2, line 8. However, referring to the use or necessity of communication protocols is significantly different from the specific method for “selecting one protocol from among a plurality of protocols,” when confronted with a new communication session (i.e., when the object is needed). See e.g., pending claim 1.



